

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-5, 7-15, and 17-33 are pending and have been amended for clarity.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3 and 7-13 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, on grounds that the phrase is unclear: “at least one of transforming a packet data frame into a data RLP frame or transforming a voice frame into a voice RLP frame using a frame type field or a control field not used in the at least one data RLP frame.” The claims have been amended to clarify these and other features of the invention.

As amended, claim 1 recites that providing said SVD service comprises “transforming a packet data frame into a data RLP frame; transforming a voice frame into a voice RLP frame; multiplexing the data RLP frame and voice RLP frame to form said RLP frame; and transmitting said RLP frame, wherein a type of the voice RLP frame is designated by information included in a frame type field or a control field not used for data in the data RLP frame.” (See, for example, Paragraphs [48]-[51], [61], [63], and [65] with reference to Figure 5 for support). Applicants submit that the amendments to claim 1 are sufficient to clarify the phrases which the Examiner found to be unclear.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, on grounds that the following phrase is unclear: “using the at least one RLP frame.” To clarify these and other features of the invention, claim 4 has been amended to recite that providing the SVD service includes “designating a voice RLP frame type using one or more bit combinations in a frame type field not used for data in a data RLP frame, the voice RLP frame generated based on the voice data and the data RLP frame generated based on the packet data; multiplexing the data

RLP frame and voice RLP frame to form said RLP frame; and transmitting said RLP frame.” (See, for example, Paragraphs [48]-[51], [61], [63], and [65] with reference to Figure 5 for support). Applicants submit that the amendments to claim 4 are sufficient to clarify the phrases which the Examiner found to be unclear.

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, on grounds that the following phrase is unclear: “using the at least one RLP frame.” To clarify these and other features, claim 5 has been amended to recite that providing the SVD service includes “designating a voice RLP frame type using one or more bit combinations in a control field not used for data in a data RLP frame, the voice RLP frame generated based on the voice data and the data RLP frame generated based on the packet data; multiplexing the data RLP frame and voice RLP frame to form said RLP frame; and transmitting said RLP frame.” (See, for example, Paragraphs [48]-[51], [61], [63], and [65] with reference to Figure 5 for support). Applicants submit that the amendments to claim 5 are sufficient to clarify the phrases which the Examiner found to be unclear.

Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, on grounds that the following phrase is unclear: “the at least one RLP frame.” To clarify these and other features, claim 14 has been amended to recite that providing the SVD service includes: “designating a voice RLP frame type using one or more bit combinations in a frame type field not used for data in a data RLP frame, the voice RLP frame generated based on the voice data and the data RLP frame generated based on the packet data; multiplexing the data RLP frame and voice RLP

frame to form said RLP frame; and transmitting said RLP frame.” (See, for example, Paragraphs [48]-[51], [61], [63], and [65] with reference to Figure 5 for support).

Claim 15 has been amended to recite “implementing in a media access control (MAC) sub-layer a voice RLP module, which transforms the voice frame into the RLP frame so that the voice RLP frame and data RLP frame can be multiplexed and transmitted in the RLP frame.” Applicants submit that the amendments to claims 14 and 15 are sufficient to clarify the phrases which the Examiner found to be unclear.

Claim 17 was rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, on grounds that the following phrase is unclear: “the at least one RLP frame.” To clarify these and other features, claim 17 has been amended to recite that providing the SVD service includes “designating a voice RLP frame type using one or more bit combinations in a control field not used for data in a data RLP frame, the voice RLP frame generated based on the voice data and the data RLP frame generated based on the packet data; multiplexing the data RLP frame and voice RLP frame to form said RLP frame; and transmitting said RLP frame.” Applicants submit that the amendments to claims 17 are sufficient to clarify the phrases which the Examiner found to be unclear.

Claims 18-25 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, on grounds that the following phrase is unclear: “at least one of transforming a packet data frame into an RLP frame or transforming a voice frame into a voice RLP frame using a frame type field or a control field not used in the at least one data RLP frame.” To clarify these and other features, claim 18 has been amended to recite that providing said SVD service comprises “transforming a packet data

frame into a data RLP frame; transforming a voice frame into a voice RLP frame; multiplexing the data RLP frame and voice RLP frame to form said RLP frame; and transmitting said RLP frame, wherein a type of the voice RLP frame is designated by information included in a frame type field or a control field not used for data in the data RLP frame.” (See, for example, Paragraphs [48]-[51], [61], [63], and [65] with reference to Figure 5 for support). Applicants submit that the amendments to claim 18 are sufficient to clarify the phrases which the Examiner found to be unclear.

Claims 26-31 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, on grounds that the following phrase is unclear: “at least one of a packet data frame is transformed into a data RLP frame or a voice frame is transformed into a voice RLP frame using a frame type field or a control field not used in the data RLP frame.”

To clarify these features, claim 26 has been amended to recite “a voice radio link protocol (RLP) module to transform voice data into a voice RLP frame; and a data RLP module at a MAC sub-layer to transform packet data into a data RLP frame, wherein the voice and data RLP frames are multiplexed and simultaneously transmitted together in an RLP frame based on outputs of the voice RLP module and data RLP module, wherein a frame type field or a control field not used for data in the data RLP frame is used to designate a type of the voice RLP frame.” (See, for example, Paragraphs [48]-[51], [61], [63], and [65] with reference to Figure 5 for support). Applicants submit that the amendments to claim 26 are sufficient to clarify the phrases which the Examiner found to be unclear.

Claim 32 was rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, on grounds that the following phrase is unclear: “transforming a voice frame into a voice RLP frame using a frame type field or a control field not used in the at least one data RLP frame.” To clarify these and other features, claim 32 has been amended to recite that providing SVD service includes “transforming a voice frame into a voice RLP frame; and designating a type of the voice RLP frame in a frame type field or a control field not used for data in a data RLP frame, wherein the voice and data RLP frames are multiplexed and transmitted in an RLP frame.” (See, for example, Paragraphs [48]-[51], [61], [63], and [65] with reference to Figure 5 for support). Applicants submit that the amendments to claim 32 are sufficient to clarify the phrases which the Examiner found to be unclear.

Claim 33 was rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, on grounds that the following phrase is unclear: “a voice frame is transformed into a voice RLP frame using a frame type field or a control field not used in the data RLP frame.” To clarify these and other features, claim 33 has been amended to recite that providing SVD service includes “a voice radio link protocol (RLP) module to transform a voice frame into a voice RLP frame; and a data RLP module at a MAC sub-layer to transmit packet data into a data RLP frame, wherein the voice and data RLP frames are multiplexed and simultaneously transmitted together in an RLP frame based on outputs of the voice RLP module and data RLP module, wherein a type of the voice RLP frame is designated using information in a frame type field or a control field not used for data in the data RLP frame.” (See, for example, Paragraphs [48]-[51], [61], [63], and [65] with

Reply to Office Action of Sept. 3, 2008

reference to Figure 5 for support). Applicants submit that the amendments to claim 33 are sufficient to clarify the phrases which the Examiner found to be unclear.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejections in the Office Action and furtherance of the application to allowance is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim  
Registration No. 36,186

Samuel W. Ntiros  
Registration No. 39,318

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
703 766-3777

**Date: December 3, 2008**

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**

\\\Fk4\Documents\2029\2029-041\172940.doc